DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 087 854 CE 000 832

AUTHOR Ginzberg, Eli
TITLE Strategies for Educational Reform. Distinguished Lecture Series No. 1.
INSTITUTION Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Center for Vocational and Technical Education.; Ohio State Univ., Columbus. Graduate School.
PUB DATE [73]
NOTE 17p.; A lecture presented at Ohio State University

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.50
DESCRIPTORS *Educational Assessment; Educational Change; *Educational Development; Educational Improvement; Educational Needs; *Educational Objectives; Educational Policy; Educational Strategies; *Evaluation Criteria; *Speeches

ABSTRACT

If freedom of inquiry is a first criterion for assessing the educational undertaking from the vantage of a human resources approach, the second is understanding the varieties of human potential. Yet, except for athletic activity, American schools have concentrated almost exclusively on the development of cognitive skills. Our schools are belated in their efforts to identify, train, and reward young people with potentials for superior performance in nonacademic, nonathletic pursuits. A third criterion relates the educational system to the contribution it makes to increasing opportunities for self-development and career progression, and a fourth criterion relates to the resources invested in education and the effective utilization of those resources. There should be general unease with the present situation because many students are bored and drop out, many students are the victims of inferior education, and increased educational expenditures are commonly opposed. There is also disagreement as to the role the school should play in transforming society. The new strategies to meet these criteria consist of nurturing children's natural curiosity, easing the transition from home to school, encouraging more State responsibility for the pupils' level of competence, linking school and the world of work, and making continuing education more attractive and accessible. (AG)

ED 087854

STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

ELI GINZBERG

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

THE CENTER FOR VOCATIONAL AND TECHNICAL EDUCATION
THE OHIO STATE UNIVERSITY
1900 KENNY ROAD
COLUMBUS, OHIO 43210

CE 000 932

MISSION OF THE CENTER

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education is an independent unit on The Ohio State University campus. It serves a catalytic role in establishing consortia to focus on relevant problems in vocational and technical education. The Center is comprehensive in its commitment and responsibility, multidisciplinary in its approach, and interinstitutional in its program.

The Center's mission is to strengthen the capacity of state educational systems to provide effective occupational education programs consistent with individual needs and manpower requirements by:

- Conducting research and development to fill voids in existing knowledge and to develop methods for applying knowledge
- Programmatic focus on state leadership development, vocational teacher education, curriculum, and vocational choice and adjustment
- Stimulating and strengthening the capacity of other agencies and institutions to create durable solutions to significant problems
- Providing a national information storage, retrieval, and dissemination system for vocational and technical education through the affiliated ERIC Clearinghouse

ED 087854

STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

by

Eli Ginzberg
A. Barton Hepburn Professor of Economics
and
Director, Conservation of Human Resources
Columbia University

Distinguished Lecture Series No. 1

1972 - 1973

Sponsored by

The Center for Vocational and Technical Education
The Ohio State University
1960 Kenny Road
Columbus, Ohio 43210

and

Graduate School
The Ohio State University
164 W. 19th Avenue
Columbus, Ohio 43210

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of The Center's Distinguished Lecture Series in Career Development is to present major, critical thinkers who will persistently challenge and stimulate the university, its colleges, departments and The Center, and the national community to the ends that goals will be clarified, priorities will be more appropriately ordered, methods will be more effective, and human lives will be enriched.

The Onio State University and The Center have selected Dr. Eli Ginzberg as its first annual distinguished lecturer in this recently established series. This presentation and new lecture series represents an expansion of the many valuable research services provided by the University and The Center. The Center and The Ohio State University feel that the contributions of Dr. Ginzberg and those to follow in the series, will provide an excellent means to further insure its mission of providing current and highly critical information to be used by educators at all levels for the improvement of existing and future educational programs.

Dr. Eli Ginzberg is a native of the state of New York. He received the degrees of A.B. (1931), A.M. (1932), and Ph.D. (1934), from Columbia University and also studied at the Universities of Heidelberg and Grenoble. Dr. Ginzberg joined the staff of the Graduate School of Business, Columbia University, in 1935, where he is now A. Barton Hepburn Professor of Economics. Dr. Ginzberg has been the Director of the Conservation of Human Resources Project since its establishment in 1950. From 1951 to 1961 he was Director of Staff Studies of the National Manpower Council.

Dr. Ginzberg has been chairman, National Manpower Advisory Committee since 1962 and serves as consultant to the Departments of State, Defense, Labor and HEW. He was elected to the Institute of Medicine, National Academy of Sciences in 1972, and is a member of the scientific Advisory Board to the U.S. Air Force since 1970. In 1970-71, he served as Chairman, Task Force on Manpower Research for the Defense Science Board.

Dr. Ginzberg was Special Assistant to the Chief Statistician of the U.S. War Department (1942-44); Director of Resources Analysis Division, Surgeon General's Office (1944-46). He was Chairman, Committee on Studies, White House Conference on Children and Youth; and has served on National Advisory Mental Health Council, 1959-1963; and on the National Advisory Allied Health Professions Council from 1969-1972. Dr. Ginzberg was also a member of the Medical Advisory Board to the Secretary of War (1946-48); Representative of the United States to the Five Power Conference on Reparations for Non-Repatriable Refugees (1946); Director of the New York State Hospital Study (1948-49); Member of the Committee on Wartime Requirements for Scientific and Specialized Personnel (1942); Medical Consultant, Hoover Commission (1952); Board of Governors of the Hebrew University of Jerusalem (1953-59).

In 1946, Dr. Ginzberg was awarded a medal by the War Department for Exceptional Civilian Service; and in 1957, he was awarded a medal by International University of Social Studies, Rome, for research contributions to the study of human resources; and in 1964, he was awarded the McKinsey Management Journal Award. University of California. In 1966, he was awarded an honorary D. Litt. by the Jewish Theological Seminary of America and honorary LL.D. by Loyola University (Chicago) in 1969. In 1971, he was elected a member of the Honorary Faculty, Industrial College of the Armed Forces; and in 1972, he received the Certificate of Merit from the U.S. Department of Labor. He also serves as consultant to various business and nonprofit organizations including DuPont, General Electric, IBM, Western Electric, National Foundation, Rockefeller Brothers Fund, the Ford Foundation, McKinsey Foundation for Management Research, and Federation of Jewish Philanthropies of New York.

Dr. Ginzberg is a Fellow of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, a member of the American Economics Association, the Academy of Political Science, Industrial Relations Research Association, American Association of University Professors, Medical Consultants of World War II (hon.), Phi Beta Kappa and Beta Gamma Sigma.

He is the author of the following books, in addition to numerous articles:

Studies in the Economics of the Bible, 1932
The House of Adam Smith, 1934
The Illusion of Economic Stability, 1939
Grass on the Slag Heaps: The Story of the Welsh Miners, 1942
Report to American Jews: On Overseas Relief, Palestine, and Refugees in the U.S., 1942
The Unemployed, 1943
The Labor Leader, 1948
A Pattern for Hospital Care, 1949
Agenda for American Jews, 1950
Occupational Choice, 1951
The Uneducated, 1953
Psychiatry and Military Manpower Policy, 1953
What Makes an Executive, 1955
The Negro Potential, 1956
Effecting Change in Large Organizations, 1957
Human Resources: The Wealth of a Nation, 1958
The Ineffective Soldier: Lessons for Management and The Nation, 1959, 3 volumes
- *The Lost Divisions*
- *Breakdown and Recovery*
- *Patterns of Performance*

The Nation's Children (editor), 1960, 3 volumes
- *The Family and Social Change*
- *Development and Education*
- *Problems and Prospects*

Values and Ideals of American Youth (editor), 1961

Planning for Better Hospital Care, 1961
The Optimistic Tradition and American Youth, 1962
The American Worker in the Twentieth Century, 1963
Democratic Values and the Rights of Management, 1963
Technology and Social Change (editor), 1964
The Troublesome Presence: American Democracy and the Negro, 1964
Talent and Performance, 1964
The Negro Challenge to the Business Community (editor), 1964
The Pluralistic Economy, 1965
Keeper of the Law: Louis Ginzberg, 1966
Life-Styles of Educated Women, 1966
Educated American Women: Self-Portraits, 1966
The Development of Human Resources, 1966
Manpower Strategy for Developing Countries, 1967
The Middle-Class Negro in the White Man's World, 1967
Manpower Agenda for America, 1968
Business Leadership and the Negro Crisis (editor), 1968
Men, Money, and Medicine, 1969
Urban Health Services: The Case of New York, 1970
Career Guidance: Who Needs It; Who Provides It; Who Can Improve It, 1971
Manpower for Development: Perspectives on Five Continents, 1971
Manpower Advice for Government, 1972
Corporate Lib: Women's Challenge to Management (editor), 1973
New York Is Very Much Alive: A Manpower View, 1973

On behalf of The Ohio State University and The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, I take considerable pleasure in introducing Dr. Eli Ginzberg's address concerning a topic of mutual concern of all educators: strategies for Educational Reform.

Robert E. Taylor
Director
The Center for Vocational
and Technical Education

STRATEGIES FOR EDUCATIONAL REFORM

1. Introduction

The fact that an economist and manpower specialist has been honored to initiate this series of distinguished lectures is proof that new winds are blowing in the educational world. Further evidence that things are changing and in the right direction is this splendid building, the completion of which is the occasion for today's celebration, a building that will enhance the effectiveness with which a large group of capable researchers are raising, and finding answers to, important educational questions.

I would also like to take note, in these introductory comments, of the partnership that The Center for Vocational and Technical Education at The Ohio State University reflects—a partnership among the federal government, the state government, and the world of academe, each concerned with using research to find new and better answers to questions in education and training.

For all of these reasons, I am pleased to be your honored first lecturer.

My approach will follow along these lines: I will begin by specifying certain criteria that I consider relevant from a human resources standpoint for assessing the goals and performance of an educational system. Next, I will seek to delineate the reasons for considerable public unease with the contemporary directions of American education. And finally, I will raise some alternative strategies for your consideration.

2. A Human Resources Approach

It is inevitable that one who has spent all but four years of his life in the educational system, as student and teacher, will see the world through the eyes of an insider. I would like to share with you one item in my personal background. In 1928-1929, I was a student at Heidelberg University when that institution was in the top rank of great universities. Within the next few years, Adolf Hitler succeeded in destroying an institution with more than five hundred years of contributions to scholarship, science, and culture.

This experience, coming as it did in the formative period of my own life as an academic, made an indelible impression upon me. It alerted me to the fact that no educational institution, not even one strongly hedged by a tradition of independence, stands immune to the dominant forces that shape and reshape the society of which it is a part. Those who devote themselves to the pursuit of knowledge and to instructing the young must have the tolerance, if not the enthusiastic support, of the society that provides them the resources they require to perform their mission. Hence, the teaching profession must be ever alert to the challenge of instilling in their pupils a love of the truth and the process of pursuing it. If they fail in this undertaking, they run the risk that they will become the henchmen of some orthodoxy, the leaders of which are more concerned with indoctrination than with the pursuit of truth. Admittedly, the purusit of free inquiry is an unsettling activity, which means that those who know its worth must be careful not to abuse the freedom that society has

granted them. If they confuse the classroom with the political arena, they will not long enjoy the freedom that once was theirs.

If freedom of inquiry is a first criterion for assessing the educational undertaking from the vantage of a human resources approach, the second is understanding the varieties of human potential.

Our conventional educational system has concerned itself almost exclusively with the nurturing of cognitive abilities. While the development of cognitive abilities are of critical importance for individual and communal performance, it is unbalanced, in fact wrong, to see them as coextensive with the totality.

But, with one major exception, American schools have concentrated almost exclusively on the development of cognitive skills. The exception is sports. At the high school and college levels, a considerable amount of institutional effort and resources is directed toward identifying young people with athletic potential, toward nurturing and training them, and toward assuring that the successful among them are well rewarded. The time is long past when our schools should seek to identify, train, and reward young people with potentials for superior performance in fields other than academic or athletic pursuits. The arts are one such arena; political capabilities, another; craftsmanship, a third; interpersonal relations, a fourth.

A third criterion with which to assess the performance of an educational system relates to the contribution it makes to the broadening of opportunity for self-development and career progression. The extent to which the house of academe is in disarray is suggested by the fact that while speaking on the campus of The Ohio State University, I find it necessary to remind the captious critics that because income inequality remains a fact of contemporary life, one dare not conclude that educational opportunity is a matter of little or no importance. The tens of thousands of young men and women from families of modest incomes who have graduated from this and other state and private institutions and who have moved toward the top of the occupational ladder are proof positive that the role of education is a potent factor in social and economic mobility.

In order not to add confusion to what is already an immeasurably confused debate, let me quickly add that I am fully aware that parental education, occupation, and income continue to be potent determinants of who goes to college. The sons and daughters from upper income families have a clear and unequivocal advantage. But with more than four out of five young people graduating from high school and with sufficient places in higher education available for all who possess the academic preparation to attend, one must exercise caution in downgrading the contribution of education to economic and social mobility. We have come considerably further than any other country, including those of Communist persuasion, in enabling young people to acquire the educational credentials that provide them access to better jobs and careers.

The fourth and last criterion relates to the resources invested in education and the effectiveness with which these resources are utilized. The first point to note is that we are currently spending about $90 billion per year for education, about 8 percent of GNP, up from 3 percent in 1929. An increase of 160 percent in the share of national product directed to education in a period of forty

years commands attention. Aside from the benefits of personal development and work and career of the individual citizen, what does education contribute to the society at large? I have been upset that the last three presidents of the United States, taking their cue from economists and educators, broadcast the message that any young person who wants a good life should stay in school and acquire a diploma or a degree. The figures never supported this claim and they still do not. All that they say is that on the average the more education a person has, the higher his lifetime earnings. But even if the figures supported the presidents' claim, I would object to people pursuing education solely for its income-raising potential. I am more sympathetic to the view of David Ben-Gurion who, when Prime Minister of Israel, advocated that all who were interested in and capable of profiting from a university education should have the opportunity to pursue advanced studies even while planning to follow eventually such mundane occupations as farmer, carpenter, soldier, chauffeur. Education was to be pursued for its own sake, not as an income-enhancing device.

From a human resources vantage we have briefly reviewed four criteria useful for judging the performance of an educational system: protecting free inquiry, nurturing a wide range of human potentials, expanding the opportunity matrix, and utilizing scarce resources effectively.

3. The Sources of Unease

The first source of unease relates to the widespread appreciation that a high proportion of students at every level of the system from elementary school to graduate school are bored with what goes on in the classroom and with their assignments out of the classroom. Boredom implies that the individual is unable to see much point or purpose in performing the task assigned to him. At best, he will put out minimal effort; more typically, he will shirk and avoid doing anything that requires effort on his part. One need not place the blame for boredom on the teaching staff, for if the student sees no point to the learning process in which he is engaged, especially if he is forced to attend class, then even the most skilled teacher may fail to engage his interest and elicit his participation. But teachers aside, there is clearly something askew with an educational system in which a significant proportion of those in attendance are bored and act accordingly.

A second cause of unease derives from the fact that a considerable proportion of high school, college, and graduate students appear to be floundering to the point where they fail to complete their studies and drop out. Ever since I visited Watts in 1965, shortly after the initial blowup, I have been cautious about drawing conclusions about dropouts, since I found that it was the best students—not the worst—who had dropped out of high school in Watts. The best ones, recognizing that they were not learning anything, refused to remain docile, even if it meant leaving without a diploma.

A third reason for unease derives from the fact that major gaps continue to exist in the educational opportunities available to different groups in the population. It is the poor, rural, and minority-group youth who are most likely to be victimized. The schools that they attend, the curricula to which they are exposed, and the teachers who instruct them are often inferior. The outcome is there for anyone to read in the rejections for mental reasons for military service. Data for 1970 help to illuminate the wide range in educational opportunity and performance. In Minnesota, New Hampshire, and Washington, the rejection rate was between .7 and .9 per 100 men. In South Carolina and

Mississippi, the rates were 25 and 22 respectively, per 100 men, or nearly 35 times as great. Such regional (and racial) differences are hard to justify in a country that prides itself on its democratic tradition and long-term support for public education.

But there are other data that indicate considerable progress in narrowing group differentials. For instance, in 1940, whites in the age group 25 to 29 had completed (on the average) 10.7 years of schooling in contrast with 7.1 years for nonwhites. In 1970, the percentages for those groups were 12.6 and 12.2, respectively. The gap of 3.6 years had narrowed to .4 of a year. A more dramatic way of stating what had occurred during the intervening 30 years is to emphasize that the educational achievement of nonwhites measured in terms of years of schooling had increased 9 times as fast as for whites!

Another cause of public unease is the fact that within a single decade (1960-1970) expenditures per student in average daily attendance increased from approximately $500 to $1,000 in stable dollars. There has been considerable concern expressed both by educators and by the lay leadership dedicated to improving the quality of public education, about the increasing resistance of taxpayers to voting additional funds for school budgets. Since the late 1960's, taxpayer resistance has mounted to a point where some large school systems have had to close before the end of the semester because of a lack of funds. And more bond issues have been defeated than approved. But voter resistance must be placed in the context of the foregoing data that highlight the fact that there has been a doubling in the dollars expended per child. Many citizens are asking about the productivity of these additional dollars. Where is the evidence that the average child is receiving a better education?

The fifth source of unease relates to the appropriate role that the school should play in the transformation of American society. The busing issue will not go away. It is worth pointing out, however, that in 1929, 7 percent of all school children were bused, while in 1970, 43 percent were bused, although most of the increase had little to do with speeding desegregation. Rather, it reflected increased consolidation.

There are additional sources of unease relating primarily to the effectiveness of increased public expenditures on behalf of education that warrant at least brief comments. We have been pursuing the path of compensatory education. The federal government has been putting in about $1.5 billion a year to this end. An advisory committee to the president and the Congress indicates that only about one-third of the dollars has been reaching the youngsters for whom they were intended. And to make matters worse, it is their view that educators do not know what it takes to design an effective compensatory program.

Many legislators have become disenchanted with educational leaders because following their advice they expanded graduate programs only to find that the country now faces a surplus of educated manpower. I was amazed to learn that Ohio State has 105 graduate programs, 78 of which offer doctoral programs. In seeking funds for expansion, the educators neglected to take into account how large a part of the new output of doctorates was being fed back into the educational system to cope with increased enrollments. They failed to appreciate that the expansion of enrollments would soon level off for a variety of reasons, demographic, economic, and intellectual and that when it did new doctorates would be a drag on the market.

There has also been growing restiveness with the economists' theory of human investment that was picked up by many educators to strengthen their case for the benefits from increased educational achievement. Long before Jencks, it was noted that about one-third of all high school graduates earn over $10,000. Even more striking is the finding that about two out of every five males with five or more years of education beyond high school earn $15,000 or more per year, while this is so for only one out of 20 women. Clearly, for many people the payoff from education remains to be proved.

4. Directions for New Strategies

Having set forth some operative criteria for assessing an educational system and having identified some of the sources of unease with the present structure, I must now meet the challenge of my title and set forth, if only in outline form, some directions for new strategies.

I want to begin by stressing that schools must be judged failures unless they do three things – nurture curiosity, instill basic skills of language, numbers, and abstract thinking, and provide guidance to individuals to help them choose among options.

If learning depends on evoking and directing the curiosity with which all humans are endowed, then the school has its task set out for itself. It must arrange the curriculum and its teaching methods to nurture and deepen the curiosity with which all children come to school and avoid at all costs assignments that squash and eliminate this primal force. I pretend to no expertise as to the changes that are called for to take advantage of this generic attribute, but I am reasonably certain that it warrants more attention than it has yet received. One major suggestion: a study of how students spend their free time out of school may be a useful clue to the extent to which their efforts in school are stimulating their curiosity. An ominous note: the average American with more than 12 years of schooling reads about one book a year! The more effective development and use of curiosity should be high on the agenda of educational research and practice.

A second area where new approaches are called for relates to the critical transition point from home to school. In general, the school does a reasonably good job in receiving the youngster from a middle class home where the parents have prepared him for school. But it is no secret that the school does a poor job with respect to the large numbers of poor and minority youth who find the transition difficult. We need a restructuring of kindergarten and grades one through three; we need new curricula and new teaching methods. If the first four years of schooling were treated as a block in which youngsters could move at their own pace to acquire basic skills, where care was taken to avoid stigmatizing anybody with premature failure and where those who were encountering difficulties had access to extra supports, the entire experience would be less intimidating and the outcomes more productive. The evidence to the contrary notwithstanding, I refuse to accept the thesis that children from disadvantaged homes cannot profit from well-designed and well-executed educational programs.

Thirdly, as the Fleischmann report in my home state recently recommended, it is essential that the state assume more responsibility than it has up to the present in ensuring that all schools within its jurisdiction assure that all pupils acquire a minimum level of competence. This recommendation

is in line with one advanced almost two centuries ago, by Adam Smith, who argued that it is the responsibility of the state to provide basic education for all its citizens. Smith suggested that a man's entrance into productive employment be dependent on his prior acquisition of such basic knowledge and skills. In Switzerland, the army returns recruits for additional instruction to their cantons if they fail to pass the educational screening test.

We also need to do much more than we have been doing in providing effective links between the school and the world of work, particularly for the non-bookish minority who have little or no intention of going on to college. Commissioner Marland's emphasis on career education is a move in the right direction. This does not mean, in my view, that occupations should be a unit of study in elementary, junior, or senior high schools. Nor does it mean that every student should be forced to acquire in school or in a school-sponsored program a manual or white-collar skill. And it also doesn't mean, in my view, the introduction of the Swedish system whereby all students spend a period of months at work during their high school years. Rather, it implies that a concern with the relation between education and work permeates the curriculum at all levels, that good educational and occupational guidance services are available, and that after the ninth grade young people who have little interest in or aptitude for academic work are afforded alternative opportunities for development.

Educators have made a serious error, in my view, in promising the country to take care of all young people up to the age of 18 inside the school. A significant minority of boys and girls cannot profit from continued exposure to the classroom. For at least part of the time, they need opportunities to work, to earn money, to be associated with adults in purposeful activities. But if a much-enlarged program of work/study is called for, educators require the help of employers, trade unions, and the community. They cannot provide the alternative developmental experiences by themselves within the confines of the school. This is the single most important challenge facing American education and it is one that requires action on a broad front.

Finally, we need to make a large number of additional adjustments to be sure that the educational system becomes more accessible to young and mature adults when they see the possibility of profiting from additional education and training. This implies a great many adjustments: in the policies adopted and funding provided by legislative bodies, in the manner in which schools operate to facilitate reentry of pupils who have dropped out or terminated their education at an earlier period, in the willingness of employers to provide time off for individuals to continue in or return to school.

5. Concluding Observations

It will require hard work on the part of researchers, administrators and teachers to determine whether and to what extent these five strategies hold promise for improving the productivity of the American educational system. We have singled out as directions that hold promise the nurturing of curiosity, improved linkages between home and school, the expansion of state responsibility for school performance, improved linkages between school and work, and easier access of adults to continuing education and training. They are nothing more—and nothing less—than the recommendations

of a student of human resources who has long been interested in and concerned about the critical role that education plays in the development of human potential. And it is this task above all others to which I believe that educators must continue to address themselves.

I do not think that the educational system should promise to be a substitute for the family, cure poverty and racism, assure individuals good jobs and good incomes, control delinquency and crime, and usher in the brave new world. What teachers should seek to do is to make their students more intelligent, more considerate, more sensitive to their own problems and to the problems of others.

Years ago, John Maynard Keynes expressed the hope that the day would come when economists would be as useful as dentists. I will paraphrase that and say I have the same hope for educators.

APPENDIX

SOME EDUCATIONAL RESEARCH NEEDS IMPLIED BY GINZBERG'S LECTURE*

Policy Setting and Leadership Issues

1. How may educational opportunities be broadened for young people from low income homes?

2. How may the proper roles be identified that schools are supposed to play in relation to American society?

3. What additional responsibility should each state assume in ensuring that all schools in its jurisdiction see to it that their pupils reach a certain minimal level of competence?

4. What minimal level of competence should students achieve?

5. What adjustments are needed, inside and outside of school, for schooling to become more generally accessible to adults?

Evaluation Issues

1. How may educational leadership account for how monetary support contributes to the lives of individuals (personal development, work, career) and the life of the society (society at large).

2. How is a school's encouragement of native curiosity to be evaluated/measured?

3. How is a school's provision of basic skills in language, numbers, and abstract thinking to be evaluated/measured?

4. How is a school's provision of guidance (to help individuals choose among options) to be evaluated/measured?

5. How may the productivity of educational dollars be measured to demonstrate educational improvement for children?

---

*By Harry L. Ammerman, Research Specialist, The Center for Vocational and Technical Education, The Ohio State University, Columbus, Ohio.

Curriculum Programs and Content Issues

1. With what dimensions of human potential, other than cognitive abilities, should schools be concerned?

2. How should the development of human potential, other than cognitive abilities, be supported by the school system?

3. What major gaps exist in the educational opportunities available for various target groups?

4. For each such gap, what effective corrective actions are possible?

5. What are the proper educational experiences for youngsters from poor and minority homes?

6. What specific measures should be taken to provide more effective links between the school and the world of work?

7. What are the curricular and instructional implications of student free-time activities for in-school stimulation of their curiosity?

Instructional Delivery System Issues

1. How may teachers inculcate into students a love for free inquiry and truth?

2. What does it take to do a good job of compensatory education?

3. In what ways can education serve to strengthen and maintain curiosity?

4. What specific contributions and support are needed from the community, from trade unions, and from employers to accomplish a more effective linkage between school and the world of work?

5. How may opportunities be provided to combine work and study to meet the needs of individual children?

6. How may opportunities be provided for many students to be in close association with adults?

7. How may opportunities be provided for many students to earn money?

8. How may schools contribute to making their students wiser, more considerate, more sensitive to the problems of people?

9. How might the first four years of schooling be operated as a block of instruction, in which the stigma of premature failure is avoided for youngsters moving at varied paces of basic skill acquisition?

Guidance Counseling Issues

1. For what reasons or goals should people pursue an education? (e.g., enhance income, enrich own life).

2. What are the reasons for (or causes of) the apparent pervasive boredom of students with what goes on in the classroom and with their assignments out of the classroom?

3. Why do many students founder and fail to complete their studies?

4. What are the distinguishing characteristics of those students who do not complete their studies?

5. What are the meaningful facts of use to the public with regard to the extent to which education pays off (i.e., is of value to individuals, to various target groups)?

6. What new approaches (curriculum, teaching methods) are useful for effecting a satisfactory transition from home to school for children from poor and minority homes?

7. What new approaches are useful for effecting a satisfactory transition from the school to work?

8. What are the educational experiences (curricula, teachers, school environment) from which youngsters from disadvantaged homes can better profit in their acquisition of basic skills?

9. For which particular individual students should a more effective linkage between school and the world of work be provided?